

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-5 are amended. New Claims 6-20 are submitted. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action the specification was objected to and Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, due to informalities. Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,437,335 to Hines, Sr. (Hines). In addition, Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hines in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,758,803 to Liao et al. (Liao). Claim 5 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hines in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,792,235 to Paul. For the reasons discussed below, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance.

In response to the objection to the specification, Applicant will submit replacement drawings shortly to add the missing reference numerals. Applicant has further amended the specification to remedy informalities, including the remaining informality identified by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claim 4 is amended in a non-narrowing manner to remove the recitation of “and/or.” Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

The present invention is directed to a powdery mold coating agent supply device. Independent Claim 1 recites a tank storing a powdery mold coating. The tank has a discharge port at lower portion. In addition, an upper end of a supply tube is connected to the discharge port, and the supply tube extends along a vertical line. A first valve is provided at an upper position of the supply tube for opening and closing the supply tube. A second valve is provided at a position of the supply tube so as to be positioned lower than that of the first valve by a predetermined distance, the second valve opening and closing the supply tube. A pressurized fluid inlet is disposed between the first and second valves and is configured to deliver a pressurized fluid to the powdery mold coating agent between the first and second valves.

Hines is directed to a soil backfilling device. As shown in Figure 6B, for example, of Hines, sand or other backfilling material can flow from a hopper 18 and fill a discharging tube 24, depending on positions of the plungers 33.¹

Applicant respectfully submits that Hines does not teach or render obvious the claimed arrangement in which a pressurized fluid inlet is disposed between first and second valves to deliver a pressurized fluid between the first and second valves as recited in independent Claim 1. Specifically, Hines does not disclose or suggest a fluid inlet disposed between the plungers 33, for example.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed features recited in independent Claim 1 can provide numerous advantages that cannot be provided by Hines. By way of specific non-limiting examples, the claimed features recited in Claim 1 can provide an agent supply device in which a powdered agent (e.g., a mold coating agent) is held in a supply tube above a valve, and after the powdered agent reaches a predetermined amount, the valve can be

¹ Column 6, lines 39-65.

opened. The powdered agent can be provided to a cavity of a mold in an extremely effective manner by providing a pressurized fluid through the inlet above the valve.²

In particular, independent Claim 1 recites “a pressurized fluid inlet disposed between the first and second valves and configured to deliver a pressurized fluid to the powdery mold coating agent between the first and second valves.” Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn, and the allowance of independent Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 2-5 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their own features. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of Claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) be withdrawn, and the allowance of dependent Claims 2-5.

Applicant respectfully asserts that new Claims 6-14 are allowable for reasons similar to those of independent Claim 1. For example, none of the references teach or render obvious the claimed arrangement recited in independent Claim 6 in which a pressurized fluid inlet is configured to deliver a pressurized fluid to a powdered coating agent between first and second valves disposed in a supply tube. Claims 7-14 depend from independent Claim 6. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of new Claims 6-14.

Applicant further respectfully asserts that new Claims 15-20 recite novel and unobvious features. For example, none of the references teach or render obvious the claimed arrangement recited in independent Claim 15 in which a pressurized fluid inlet is configured to deliver a pressurized fluid to a powdered coating agent in a measuring device, with the measuring device configured to receive a fixed amount of the powdered coating agent from a tank and to deliver the powdered coating agent to a supply tube. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of new Claims 15-20.

² Please see, in part, from page 11, line 3, to page 14, line 2, of Applicant’s originally filed specification, as well as original Figures 7 and 8, which detail results of Applicant’s comparative experiments.


Application No. 10/025,483
Reply to Office Action of September 1, 2004

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Steven P. Weihrouch
Registration No. 32,829
Attorney of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Philip J. Hoffmann
Registration No. 46,340

SPW/PJH/ac

I:\ATTY\PH\21S\217758\PRP AM 01DEC2004_REVISED.DOC